

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 21, 2003, the Examiner rejected all pending claims. The Examiner also rejected to the drawing of claims toward the pivotal motor because the pivoting motion was not illustrated in the drawings. The Examiner also objected to errors in the specification found on page 11, Claims 1, 5, 7 and 19 for being indefinite and Claims 20, 24-25 as depending from canceled claims. In response, Applicant has removed language in the claims drawn to a pivoting motor to overcome the rejections of the drawings. In order to overcome the objection to the specification, Applicant has submitted a marked up copy of Page 11 without the identified errors. Applicant has also changed the claim language in order to eliminate use of the term "parallelepiped". Applicant has amended Claims 20 and 25 and canceled claim 24 in order to overcome the rejections for being indefinite.

The Examiner indicated that the claims would contain allowable subject matter if they were rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. Applicant believes that the amended claims overcome those rejections.

For all the above reasons, Applicant now believes that the application should be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If, for some reason, any other issues remain, a telephone conference with the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Allen F. Bennett, Reg. No. 50,199  
HEAD, JOHNSON & KACHIGIAN  
228 West 17th Place  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119  
(918) 587-2000  
Attorneys for Applicant